arXiv:1407.2991v2 [cs.GT] 29 Aug 2015

Price of Anarchy in Networks with Heterogeneous Latency Functions

Sanjiv Kapoor *and Junghwan Shin †

Abstract

In this paper we consider the *price of anarchy* (PoA) in multi-commodity flows where the latency or delay function on an edge has a heterogeneous dependency on the flow commodities, i.e. when the delay on each link is dependent on the flow of individual commodities, rather than on the aggregate flow. An application of this study is the performance analysis of a network with differentiated traffic that may arise when traffic is prioritized according to type classification. This study has implications in the debate on net-neutrality. We provide *price of anarchy* bounds for networks with k (types of) commodities where each link is associated with specific classes of heterogeneous polynomial delays, i.e. commodity i on edge e faces delay specified by $h_i^e(f_1(e), f_2(e), \ldots, f_k(e))$ where $f(e)$ is the flow vector and $f_i(e)$ is the flow of the ith commodity through edge e and $h_i^e()$ a polynomial delay function applicable to the ith commodity. We consider both atomic and non-atomic flows and show that the price of anarchy is unbounded for arbitrary polynomials, while it is bounded for polynomials where every term has degree θ.

For networks with *decomposable delay functions* where the delay is the same for all commodities using the edge, i.e. delays on edge e are defined by $h^e(f_1(e), f_2(e), \ldots, f_k(e))$ we show an improved bound on the price of anarchy. We consider both non-atomic and atomic flows in our analysis.

The results illustrate that inefficiency worsens in the case of heterogenous delays as compared to the standard delay functions that do not consider type differentiation.

1 Introduction

The problem of selfish routing in multi-commodity networks is a well-studied topic. The inefficiency of Nash equilibrium flows, with respect to the total latency or delay of the flow, has been quantified in [14, 12]. The bounds presented apply to latency or delay on edges that are a function of the aggregate flow on the edge. In this paper we consider an important generalization: we consider the price of anarchy for non-atomic and atomic k-commodity network flows where edges are associated with delay functions that are dependent on the type of the commodity, termed *heterogeneous* delay function, an example being polynomial delays of the form $a_1(e)f_1^\theta(e) + a_2(e)f_2^\theta(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k^\theta(e) + c(e)$ where f_i represents the load contribution of the ith commodity and θ the degree of the polynomial. Here, $a_1(e), a_2(e), \ldots, a_k(e)$ and $c(e)$ are non-negative integers.

The model we consider has applications in transport networks [16]. As an application to the internet, we can use this model in the context of the *net-neutrality* debate[18, 19] where the impact of favoring a particular type of flow, say j, can be modeled by increasing its contribution to the delay via the co-efficient $a_j(e)$. We study the *price of anarchy*(PoA) in this context and

*Computer Science, IIT, Chicago, IL, e-mail: kapoor@iit.edu
†Computer Science, IIT, Chicago, IL, e-mail: byulpyo@gmail.com

show an increased PoA as compared to networks where the delay is simply $f^{\theta}(e)$ where $f(e)$ is the total flow on the edge. Our results indicate that type differentiation amongst traffic can lead to a worse price of anarchy as compared to the equal treatment of traffic, thus bolstering the defense of *net-neutrality* and motivating further similar studies.

The notion of commodity dependent delays was first studied in Dafermos [16, 17] where the author considers a transportation network where travel time on a link depends crucially on the delays of the types of traffic. One example of such a delay function, on edge e for commodity i, is provided by $\Phi_e^i(f_1, \ldots, f_k) = \sum_j g_{ij}(e) f_i(e) f_j(e) + h_i(e) f_i(e)$, where g_{ij} and h_i are constants and i, j represent commodities. Dafermos [16, 17] establishes a condition (positive definite matrix $[g_{ij}]$) under which the flow satisfies (i) Nash Equilibrium conditions and (ii) optimizes an aggregate objective function.

In this paper we consider the inefficiency of Nash equilibrium, by considering the standard measure of the price of anarchy, in networks with the following total delay function.

$$\sum_{i,e} f_i(e)\Phi_e^i(f_1, \ldots, f_k) = \sum_{i,e} f_i(e)(h_i^e(f_1(e), f_2(e), \ldots, f_k(e))).$$

where $f_i(e)$ is the flow function and $h_i^e : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ represents a convex polynomial delay function for commodity i on edge e, respectively. The delay function, whose domain is multi-dimensional, is termed as a *heterogenous* delay function.

If the delay function, $\Phi_e()$, is expressible as $h^e(f_1(e), f_2(e), \ldots, f_k(e))$, i.e. the delay function on the edge is independent of the commodity, then we call this delay function *decomposable*. This is actually an interesting class of functions, since edge behavior typically is the same as presented to each of the multiple types. Further, we define *uniform* delay function as decomposable delay functions of the form $h(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k) + a(e)$, where the dependency on the flow vector is independent of the edges (the delay is still dependent on the edge though).

We consider both atomic and non-atomic flows. In atomic flows, each flow request is required to be satisfied on one path and in non-atomic networks the flow requests arise from multiple infinitesimal demands.

We provide upper and lower bounds on the *price of anarchy* when there are k types of commodities in networks with heterogeneous and decomposable (including uniform) class of polynomial delay functions. In particular, we show asymptotically tight price of anarchy bounds when the edges are associated with affine decomposable delay functions.

Previous Work: We review prior work, that is often cited in the study of equilibria of flow routing problems, initiated by Pigou [20], and furthered by Wardrop [11]. In [15], Dafermos and Sparrow study the relationship between flows that are at Nash Equilibrium and flows that optimize a social welfare function. They consider a multi-commodity flow network with a delay function on the edges and establish a condition under which the flow satisfies both Nash Equilibrium conditions and also optimizes an aggregate objective function, where the delay depends on the total flow throughout the edge. The assumption is that units traveling along a link uniformly share the cost [15]. The interesting aspect of this work is that for homogeneous polynomial costs over the aggregate variable $f(e)$, Nash equilibrium and social optimum solutions coincide. This is not so in a general setting. The study of the inefficiency of Nash Equilibria [13] in network flows led to an analysis of price of anarchy for load dependent delays [14]. Roughgarden and Tardos initiated the study of bounds on the price of anarchy [12] in general networks followed by subsequent results by Roughgarden [25, 26] and Correa et al. [8, 27, 10] that studied the price of anarchy with respect to the optimum total latency. For the

case where the price of anarchy is considered with respect to *min-max delays*, results of Weitz[7] and Roughgarden[12] show that the price of anarchy is dependent on the size of the network.

One closely related work is the player-specific congestion game [6, 5] which allows for player specific delays but which still uses the aggregate flow to compute delays. Other congestion games include malicious players [4, 3] and more recently result on the price of anarchy have been illustrated when the delay function is defined by the L_p norm [2]

For atomic flows, the price of anarchy [1] has been investigated for an un-splittable model with aggregate delay functions, which are independent of types of commodities. Further, in [21] an exact bound was proved on the worst-case PoA for unweighted and weighted in atomic un-splittable congestion games.

To our knowledge, the price of anarchy for heterogeneous latency functions has not been studied before.

Motivation We outline motivations from two different areas, one being transportation engineering and the other computer networks.

Transportation Networks. In transportation science, traffic equilibrium has been considered extensively to analyze transportation systems, starting with the work of Wardrop. Note that this prior work has limitations in modeling multiple vehicle types or multi-modal networks. In order to provide more accurate modeling, transportation science models were extended to the multi class model where the demand is partitioned into multiple classes and the cost of a route is dependent on the traffic of all user classes along the route[17].

Multi-class models have been defined to extend the notion of Wardrop equilibrium by Dafermos and Potts and Oliver[33, 17], where in the latter paper they used the generalized BPR (Bureau of Public Roads) model that depend on multiple class parameters. Multi-class models may also be found in [32].

Computer Networks. One of the primary motivations of this research comes from a study of the impact of providing differentiated service to different types of traffic. Suppose we have k types of traffic and traffic types are given priorities. The delay function for the class with the kth priority in a $M/G/1$ queuing system is $E(T_k) = E(R)/(1 - \sum_{1\leq j\leq k-1} \rho_j)(1 - \sum_{1\leq j\leq k} \rho_j)$, where $E(R)$ is the mean residual service time and ρ_k is the load of the class-k traffic. The average delay is obtained from the expected delay of all commodities [29]. As a first attempt to incorporate the differentiated service rates, these delay may be modeled by a polynomial obtained via a Taylor series expansion (with as many terms as would provide the desired accuracy). The study of polynomial delay functions in this research is applicable in this context.

Furthermore, in this research we utilize the traditional routing model where users are able to plan routing paths based on the delays in the network. These results thus apply to transportation networks as well as computer networks that rely on the link state of the network. A possible extension would be to find the price of anarchy using the internet routing model by Papadimitriou and Valiant [30].

Our Results and Techniques for Non-atomic Network Flows: Our initial result is negative. We show that the price of anarchy for convex heterogeneous functions can grow unbounded with the flow requirement. However if we consider the class of heterogenous θ-polynomial delay functions then we can provide bounds on the price of anarchy that are not dependent on the network size or the requirements. We define θ-polynomial delay functions to be multivariate polynomial functions where every term has degree θ and which contain independent terms for each commodity (absence of independent terms leads to unbounded price of anarchy).

This includes the class of linear functions. The existence of Nash Equilibrium follows from the results in [12] which show the existence of a Nash Equilibrium flow in k-commodity non-atomic networks with convex delay functions. Our results show that the price of Anarchy is bounded by a function of the polynomial size, degree and coefficients. We also describe lower bound examples. These results extend previous results on the price of anarchy, more specifically the surprising result that [12] presents. In summary:

- We provide a bound on the *Price of Anarchy* in networks with k (types of) commodities where each edge is associated with heterogenous θ-polynomial delay functions. This bound is $a_{max}(2kN_\Phi)^{\theta+1}$ in the most general form of the network where N_Φ is to represent the maximum number of terms in the delay function over all edges. For notational convenience, throughout this paper, we let $a_{max} = \frac{\max_{i,j,e} g_{ij}(e)}{\min_{i,j,e} g_{ij}(e)}$ where $g_{ij}(e)$ is the coefficient of the jth term in the polynomial $h_i^e()$. In the case of decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions, the bound is $(\theta+1)a_{max}k^{\theta-1}$. When we consider networks with heterogeneous affine (i.e. $\theta = 1$) delay functions, the bound is $\frac{k^4 a_{max}+(k^4 a_{max})^{1/2}(k^4 a_{max}+4)^{1/2}}{2} + 1$.
- To get sharper bounds for the decomposable θ-polynomial case we introduce a multi-dimensional version of the Pigou bound [12] as well as another bound which we term as the *Gamma* bound. Combining the two provides us tight bounds.
- Examples illustrate that our results for affine functions we get tight bounds.

Our Results and Techniques for Atomic Network Flows: We also consider atomic flows. Wherever necessary we will assume that the instance provided has a Nash equilibrium. For the case of atomic flows our analysis is summarized below.

1. We show the existence of Nash equilibrium for uniform heterogenous affine delay functions. Further, we show that for non-uniform heterogenous affine functions, where edges have different delay functions, Nash Equilibrium need not exist. The second result is indeed surprising, especially since it only requires affine functions to generate the examples.
2. We consider the *price of anarchy* for atomic flows in networks with k (types of) commodities where each edge is associated with decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions. When we consider networks with decomposable affine delay functions this bound is $\frac{a_{max}+(a_{max}^2+4a_{max})^{1/2}}{2}+1$. In the case of decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions, the bound is $a_{max}(N_\Phi + k\theta)^{\theta+1}$.
3. Further, for atomic flows in networks with two different types of commodities and uniform delay functions, i.e. delays defined by $a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2 + c(e)$, we show an improved bound on the *price of anarchy*. This is achieved by considering the cycles that arise when the Nash equilibrium and social optimum flows are overlaid, canceling common flows. We provide a bound of $\sqrt{a_{max}} + 2$. This bound is asymptotically tight.

We present preliminaries in Section 2 and discuss relevant properties. In Section 3, we consider bounds for the price of anarchy for nonatomic networks with decomposable delay functions. Further, we present our results for atomic flows (Section 4) and strengthen our results on the *price of anarchy* in two-commodity network flows with uniform delay functions in Section 4.3.

2 Preliminary

We consider a directed network $G = (V, E)$ with a vertex set V and edge set E, and a set K of k source-destination pairs $\{s_1, t_1\}, \ldots, \{s_k, t_k\}$. We do not allow self-loops for any vertex but we accept parallel edges between any pair of vertices.

For commodity i, denote the set of (simple) s_i-t_i paths by $\mathcal{P}^i$, and define a set of paths $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup \mathcal{P}^i$. For any path $P \in \mathcal{P}$, we define a flow, $f_P \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The set of all flows is represented by the flow vector $f = (f_P)_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$. For a fixed flow f, commodity i and an edge $e \in E$ we denote of flow for commodity i through edge e by $f_i(e) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^i | e \in P} f_P$ and the flow vector on the edge by $f(e) = (f_i(e))_{i \in K}$. The total aggregate flow through edge e is denoted by $||f(e)||_1 = \sum_i f_i(e)$. The demand requirement of commodity 1 through k is denoted by $R = (r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ where r_i represents the amount of flow required to be pushed from source s_i to destination t_i. We call f as a *feasible* flow if all demand requirements from each commodity are satisfied, i.e., $\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}^i} f_P = r_i, \forall i$.

We let $\Phi_e : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a heterogeneous delay function on edge e, and assume that $\Phi_e()$ is nonnegative and convex. The delay function of a path $P \in \mathcal{P}^i$ is defined to be

$$\Phi_P(f) = \sum_{e \in P} \Phi_e^i(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))$$

where $\Phi_e^i(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))$ represents delay on edge e faced by commodity i under flow pattern f.

A heterogeneous delay function is a generalization of the standard aggregate delay function $\widetilde{\Phi}$. In the most general case, we consider polynomial *heterogeneous* delay functions on e for commodity i represented by $h_i^e(f_1(e), f_2(e), \ldots, f_k(e)) + c_i(e)$ where $f_i(e)$ is the flow of commodity i on edge e, and nonnegative $c_i(e)$ are constants and $h_i^e(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k)$ is any arbitrary polynomial of degree θ.

We further restrict attention to polynomials such that all terms have degree θ and that contain independent terms for each variable, i.e. contains $\sum_i a_i x_i^\theta, \ \forall i$, where $\theta \in \mathcal{N}$. Any polynomial delay that does not have independent terms corresponding to each of the variables can be shown to have an unbounded price of anarchy (see appendix). We term such functions as θ-complete polynomials or θ-polynomials for short. Also, we define N_Φ to represent the maximum number of terms in the polynomial $\Phi_e()$ over all e.

The total delay on edge e that commodity i incurs is as follows:

$$f_i(e)\Phi_e^i(f_1, \ldots, f_k) = f_i(e)(h_i^e(f_1, \ldots, f_k) + c_i(e))$$

In the case of heterogeneous delay functions, each commodity might have different commodity related delay functions on the same edge e. However, under the condition that $h_i^e() = h_j^e(), \ \forall i, j$ the total delay is expressible as

$$(f_1(e) + \ldots + f_k(e))(h_e(f_1, \ldots, f_k) + c(e)),$$

and the delay function is termed as *decomposable*.

Further, we define *uniform* functions as decomposable delay functions where the delay is independent of the edge, i.e. is of the form: $g(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k) + c(e)$.

Given an instance (G, R, Φ), we define the social cost to be the sum total of all delays on edges over flows of all commodities, i.e. $C(f) = \sum_{e \in E} \sum_i f_i(e)\Phi_e^i(f_1(e), f_2(e), \ldots, f_k(e))$. Let f and $\hat{f}$ be a Nash Equilibrium and a social optimum flow, respectively. Then the worst case Nash Equilibrium cost is denoted by $C_{NE}(f) = \max_{f \in \mathcal{E}} C(f)$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of all

Nash Equilibrium solutions and the social optimum cost $C_{SO}(\hat{f}) = \min_f C(f)$ where $\hat{f} = \arg\min_f C(f)$. The price of anarchy is defined as follows:

$$PoA = \frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})}.$$

With respect to an instance (G, R, Φ), a feasible flow minimizing $C(f)$ is said to be an optimal or minimum-delay flow; such a flow always exists because the space of all feasible flows is a compact set and our cost function is continuous.

3 Part I: The Non-Atomic Case

In this section we consider the case of Non-Atomic network flow games. We consider heterogenous functions with polynomial delays.

We summarize our contributions on the upper bound for the price of anarchy in non-atomic selfish routing problems in the following table, Table 1.

PoA	k commodities	
	affine	θ-polynomial
Aggregate	4/3	$\Theta\left(\frac{\theta}{\log\theta}\right)$
Decomposable	$\max(2a_{max})^{\dagger}$ [Thm. 3.7]	$(\theta+1)a_{max}k^{\theta-1}$ [Thm. 3.7]
Heterogeneous	$(k^4a_{max} + \sqrt{(k^4a_{max})(k^4a_{max}+4)})/2 + 1$ [Thm. 3.11]	$a_{max}(2kN_\Phi)^{\theta+1}$ [Thm. 3.9]

Table 1: PoA for Nonatomic (†indicates an asymptotically tight bound)

For general heterogenous functions, the price of anarchy is unbounded. As the table shows, we obtain upper bounds on the price of anarchy for heterogenous delays for the interesting cases where the function is decomposable and when we consider special classes of polynomials.

To show bounds on PoA we will use the following *variational inequality characterization* [22], the proof of which is simple.

Lemma 3.1 *Let f be a feasible flow for the non-atomic instance (G, R, Φ). The flow f is a Nash equilibrium flow if and only if*

$$\sum_e \sum_i f_i(e)\Phi_e^i(f_1, \ldots, f_k) \leq \sum_e \sum_i \hat{f}_i(e)\Phi_e^i(f_1, \ldots, f_k)$$

for every flow $\hat{f}$ feasible for (G, R, Φ).

3.1 Price of Anarchy is Unbounded for Heterogeneous Polynomial Delays

In this subsection we show lower bounds on the price of anarchy in 2-commodity non-atomic networks with heterogeneous polynomial delay functions. It is surprising that even in 2-commodity networks with delay functions that are sums of monomials, the price of anarchy depends on the demand requirement. The example in the appendix further illustrates this unbounded nature.

We consider an example of a 2-commodity network with 2 edges, illustrated in figure 1. In this network, the top edge e_1 is associated with the delay function $\Phi_{e_1}(f_1(e_1), f_2(e_1)) = af_1^\theta + f_2$; the bottom edge e_2 is associated with the delay function $\Phi_{e_2}(f_1(e_2), f_2(e_2)) = f_1 + af_2^\theta$.

Demand requirements are defined as $r_1 = r_2 = r$. The worst-case Nash equilibrium flow vector f is achieved when $f_1(e_1) = r$ and $f_2(e_2) = r$ and consequently cost of Nash Equilibrium, $C_{NE}(f) = 2ar^{\theta+1}$. Conversely the social optimum flow $\hat{f}$ can be obtained from $f_2(e_1) = r$ and $f_1(e_2) = r$ and the social optimum cost is $C_{SO}(\hat{f}) = 2r^2$.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of general polynomial heterogeneous delay functions. Let $(G, R = (r, r), \Phi)$ be a nonatomic 2-commodity flow instance such that $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}$. The price of anarchy of nonatomic 2-commodity flow routing on (G, R, Φ) is $\Omega(r^{\theta-1})$.*



Figure 1: General Polynomial and Heterogeneous Latency

3.2 PoA for k-Commodity non-atomic Networks; the decomposable case

We next consider the price of anarchy for k-commodity non-atomic network flow congestion games where each edge is associated with a decomposable delay function.

3.3 A Lower Bound on PoA

We consider an example of a k-commodity network, with k edges, illustrated in figure 2. In this network, the i-th edge e_i is associated with the delay function $\Phi_{e_i}(f_1(e_i), \ldots, f_k(e_i)) = f_1^\theta(e_i) + f_2^\theta(e_i) + \ldots + a_i f_i^\theta(e_i) + \ldots + f_k^\theta(e_i)$. Demand requirements are defined as $r_1 = \ldots = r_k = 1$. We let $a_i = a, \forall i$. The worst-case Nash equilibrium flow vector f is achieved when $f_j(e_j) = 1, 1 \leq j \leq k$ and consequently the NE cost $C_{NE}(f) = ak$. Conversely the social optimum flow $\hat{f}$ can be obtained from $\hat{f}_\ell(e_j) = 1/(k-1)$ when $\ell \neq j$, $1 \leq \ell, j \leq k$ and the social optimum is cost $C_{SO}(\hat{f}) = k/(k-1)^{\theta-1}$.

Lemma 3.3 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions. Let (G, R, Φ) be a nonatomic k-commodity flow instance such that $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}$. The price of anarchy of nonatomic k-commodity flow routing on (G, R, Φ) is $\Omega(a_{max}(k-1)^{\theta-1})$, where $a_{max} = \max_i\{a_i\} = a$.*



Figure 2: Decomposable θ-Polynomial Latency

3.4 Bounds on PoA for Decomposable Heterogenous Delays

As discussed in the introduction, it has been shown that Nash equilibrium flow is equivalent to a social optimum flow under homogeneous aggregate delay functions. However, generally

this does not hold, and even with an affine delay function, PoA is bounded by 4/3. In this section we establish upper bounds for the PoA for heterogenous decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions which, unfortunately, are worse than those for the aggregate functions.

3.4.1 The Gamma-Pigou Bound

We first establish an approach to determining the upper bounds on the price of anarchy. We consider decomposable functions. We omit the edge notation (e) to simplify notations.

For the delay functions that we consider, the standard Pigou bound arguments do not apply. We thus consider a multi-dimensional version of the Pigou bound, which in itself does not suffice. In the first subsection below we establish that the price of anarchy is bounded by the worse of two bounds, the generalized Pigou bound and the *Gamma* bound, which we describe in detail below. In the subsequent subsection we analyze these bounds in the context of the delay functions defined by decomposable degree-θ polynomial functions.

We first describe the multi-dimensional version of the Pigou bound [12] as applied to vectors of flow that represent the k types of commodities.

Definition 1 (Genaralized Pigou bound) Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a nonempty set of cost functions. The Pigou bound $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$ for $\mathcal{C}$ is

$$\alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{x,r \geq 0} \frac{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||r||_1 \Phi(r_1, \ldots, r_k)}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||x||_1 \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) + (||r||_1 - ||x||_1)\Phi(r_1, \ldots, r_k)},$$

where $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_k)$ and $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ and $r, x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ with the understanding that $0/0 = 1$. $r_1, \ldots, r_k$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ are nonnegative and

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{r,x: ||x||_1 \geq ||r||_1} \frac{\Phi_e(r_1, \ldots, r_k))}{\Phi_e(x_1, \ldots, x_k)}$$

We split our analysis into two cases: 1)$||x||_1 < ||r||_1$ and 2)$||x||_1 \geq ||r||_1$. In the case when $||x||_1 < ||r||_1$, we consider the generalized Pigou bound as described above. However, we will evaluate the Pigou bound in a restricted setting by using the following mathematical program (SC):

$$\textbf{SC: } \alpha(\mathcal{C}) = \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{x,r \geq 0} \frac{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||r||_1 \Phi(r_1, , \ldots, r_k)}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||x||_1 \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) + (||r||_1 - ||x||_1)\Phi(r_1, \ldots, r_k)} \text{ subject to}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) &\leq \Phi(r_1, \ldots, r_k) \\ ||x||_1 &< ||r||_1 \end{aligned}$$

Note that when $\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) > \Phi(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$, $||x||_1(\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) - \Phi(r_1, \ldots, r_k))$ becomes positive and decreases the value of $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$: thus we assume that $\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \leq \Phi(r_1, \ldots, r_k)$.

For the second case, we will consider a different ratio, termed the *Gamma Bound*, as defined above and restated in a form that will be used in the proof below:

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{r,x: ||x||_1 \geq ||r||_1} \frac{\Phi_e(r_1, \ldots, r_k)||r||_1 + \Phi_e(r_1, \ldots, r_k)(||x||_1 - ||r||_1)}{\Phi_e(x_1, \ldots, x_k)||x||_1}$$

In our proof, $\hat{f}$ and f will indicate optimal and Nash equilibrium flows on edge $e \in E$. We will let $E_{||f(e)|| > ||\hat{f}(e)||}$ be the set of all edges with the property that $||f(e)||_1 > ||\hat{f}(e)||_1$.

Theorem 3.4 (Gamma-Pigou Bound) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of heterogenous decomposable polynomials and $\alpha(\mathcal{C}), \gamma(\mathcal{C})$ the Pigou, Gamma bounds, respectively, for $\mathcal{C}$. If $N = (G, R, \Phi)$ is a non-atomic k-commodity instance of the network congestion game with delay function $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}$, then the price of anarchy of congestion games in the network N is at most* $\max\{\alpha(\mathcal{C}), \gamma(\mathcal{C})\}$.

Proof: Let $\hat{f}$ and f be the optimal and Nash equilibrium flow, respectively, for a non-atomic instance (G, R, Φ) with delay functions in the set $\mathcal{C}$. We let the total cost of flow f be $C_{NE}(f)$. To prove the theorem we note that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{SO}(\hat{f}) &= \sum_{e\in E} \Phi_e(\hat{f}_1(e), \ldots, \hat{f}_k(e))||\hat{f}(e)||_1 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\alpha(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||>||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))||f(e)||_1 + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||>||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))(||\hat{f}(e)||_1 - ||f(e)||_1) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||\leq||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))||f(e)||_1 + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||\leq||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))(||\hat{f}(e)||_1 - ||f(e)||_1) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\alpha(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||>||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))||f(e)||_1 + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||\leq||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))||f(e)||_1 + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||>||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))(||\hat{f}(e)||_1 - ||f(e)||_1) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||\leq||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))(||\hat{f}(e)||_1 - ||f(e)||_1) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\alpha(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||>||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))||f(e)||_1 + \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})} \sum_{e\in E_{||f||\leq||\hat{f}||}} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))||f(e)||_1 \\
&\geq \min\{\frac{1}{\alpha(\mathcal{C})}, \frac{1}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})}\} \sum_{e\in E} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_k(e))||f(e)||_1 = \frac{C_{NE}(f)}{\max\{\alpha(\mathcal{C}), \gamma(\mathcal{C})\}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

The first inequality follows from the definition of the Pigou bound applied to each edge in $E_{||f||>||\hat{f}||}$ and the *Gamma* bound w.r.t. edges in $E_{||f||\leq||\hat{f}||}$. Here we split the edge set into two cases as mentioned before : $E_{||f||>||\hat{f}||}$ and $E_{||f||\leq||\hat{f}||}$ indicates a set of edges with $||f(e)||_1 > ||\hat{f}(e)||_1$ and $||f(e)||_1 \leq ||\hat{f}(e)||_1$, respectively. The second inequality can be obtained by rearranging terms in the first inequality and the third and the fourth terms in the second inequality can be ignored by combining together due to the variational inequality characterization. □

3.4.2 POA in k-commodity non-atomic flow with polynomial decomposable delay function

In this subsection we consider network instances where the delay function of each path is defined as a decomposable θ-complete polynomial functions (in short decomposable θ-polynomials).

Let us consider the case when $||f||_1 \leq ||\hat{f}||_1$ on edge e.

Lemma 3.5 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions. If (G, R, Φ) is a non-atomic instance with delay functions $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}$, then $\gamma(\mathcal{C}) \leq a_{max} k^{\theta-1}$.*

Proof: When $f_1 + \ldots + f_k \leq \hat{f}_1 + \ldots + \hat{f}_{k'}$ on edge e, we minimize the social optimum delay by considering $\hat{f}_1 + \ldots + \hat{f}_{k'} = ||f||_1$. We omit the dependency on e for simplicity.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma(\mathcal{C}) &= \frac{\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k)}{\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_{k'})} && (1)\\
&\leq \frac{\sum_\ell g_{i\ell} f_1^{\theta_1 \ell} f_2^{\theta_2 \ell} \cdots f_k^{\theta_k \ell} + c}{a_1 \hat{f}_1^\theta + \ldots + a_{k'} \hat{f}_{k'}^\theta} && (2)\\
&\leq \frac{\max_{il} g_{il}}{\min_i a_i} \frac{f_1^\theta + \ldots + f_k^\theta + f_1^{\theta_1} f_2^{\theta_2} \cdots f_k^{\theta_k} + \ldots}{\hat{f}_1^\theta + \ldots + \hat{f}_{k'}^\theta} && (3)\\
&< \frac{\max_{il} g_{il}}{\min_i a_i} \frac{f_1^\theta + \ldots + f_k^\theta + f_1^{\theta_1} f_2^{\theta_2} \cdots f_k^{\theta_k} + \ldots}{k'((f_1 + \ldots + f_k)/k')^\theta} && (4)\\
&\leq \frac{\max_{il} g_{il}}{\min_i a_i} k'^{\theta-1} \frac{f_1^\theta + \ldots + f_k^\theta + f_1^{\theta_1} f_2^{\theta_2} \cdots f_k^{\theta_k} + \ldots}{(f_1 + \ldots + f_k)^\theta} && (5)\\
&\leq \frac{\max_{il} g_{il}}{\min_{il} g_{il}} k'^{\theta-1} \frac{(f_1 + \ldots + f_k)^\theta}{(f_1 + \ldots + f_k)^\theta} && (6)\\
&\leq a_{max} k^{\theta-1} && (7)
\end{aligned}
$$

In (2), ℓ represents ℓ-th term in delay function $\Phi()$ and $\theta_1 + \ldots + \theta_k = \theta$ since delay function is decomposable θ-polynomial and to minimize the divisor, i.e. we have used only the sum of monomials, $\sum_j a_j f_j^\theta$, contained in $\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k)$. Since $\hat{f}_1 + \ldots + \hat{f}_{k'} = ||f||_1$ the minimum value of the divisor is achieved when $\hat{f}_1 = \ldots = \hat{f}_{k'} > ||f||_1/k'$. Finally, (7) can be obtained since $k' \leq k$. □

As shown in $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$ definition, $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$ depends on $\gamma(\mathcal{C})$. From Lemma 3.5, we consider $\gamma(\mathcal{C})$ as constant value when we calculate $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$. Now let us consider the case when $||f||_1 > ||\hat{f}||_1$ on an edge e.

Lemma 3.6 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions and $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$ the Pigou bound for $\mathcal{C}$. Let (G, R, Φ) be a non-atomic k-commodity flow instance such that $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}$. The Pigou bound for congestion games on (G, R, Φ) is $\alpha(\mathcal{C}) \leq (\theta + 1)\gamma(\mathcal{C})$.*

Proof: We consider the value of the Pigou bound and find a bound on the infimum of the divisor, $\beta(\mathcal{C})$, instead of supremum of $\alpha(\mathcal{C})$ for simplicity. And again we omit the dependency on e. We let $\Phi(f) = \sum_i \sum_\ell g_{i\ell} f_1^{\theta_1^\ell} f_2^{\theta_2^\ell} \cdots f_k^{\theta_k^\ell} + c$ where $\sum_{j=1}^{j=k} \theta_j^\ell = \theta$ and which, by the assumptions of θ-complete polynomials, includes the terms $\sum_i a_i f_i^\theta$.

Given a requirement vector R we find a vector $\hat{f}$, as required in the definition of the Pigou bound. The function $\beta(\mathcal{C})$ is convex and thus by KKT conditions w.l.o.g assume that $\hat{f}_i > 0$

and $\frac{\partial\beta(\mathcal{C})}{\partial\hat{f}_i} = 0$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k'\}$, where $|\{i \in K | \hat{f}_i > 0\}| = k'$. Note thus that by the equations, $\frac{\partial\beta(\mathcal{C})}{\partial\hat{f}_i} = 0$ for $i, 1 \leq i \leq k'$, we can obtain

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C})||\hat{f}||_1\partial\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)/\partial\hat{f}_i - \Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) + \gamma(\mathcal{C})\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k) = 0$$

which can be written as

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C})||\hat{f}||_1\partial\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)/\partial\hat{f}_i = \Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) - \gamma(\mathcal{C})\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k).$$

Let us multiply the above with $\hat{f}_i$. Then

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C})||\hat{f}||_1\hat{f}_i\partial\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)/\partial\hat{f}_i = \hat{f}_i(\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) - \gamma(\mathcal{C})\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)).$$

and let us further sum over all $1 \leq i \leq k'$,

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C})\sum_{i=1}^{k'}||\hat{f}||_1\hat{f}_i\partial\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)/\partial\hat{f}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k'}\hat{f}_i(\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) - \gamma(\mathcal{C})\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k))$$

which is equivalent to

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C})||\hat{f}||_1\sum_{i=1}^{k'}\hat{f}_i\partial\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)/\partial\hat{f}_i = ||\hat{f}||_1(\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) - \gamma(\mathcal{C})\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)).$$

Since θ is the maximum degree and positive and all terms obtained in the differential are nonnegative, adding all the required terms involving the differential in the LHS of the above equation gives:

$$\theta\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k'}\hat{f}_i\partial\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)/\partial\hat{f}_i$$

and thus

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C})||\hat{f}||_1\theta\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k) \geq ||\hat{f}||_1(\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) - \gamma(\mathcal{C})\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k)).$$

By eliminating $||\hat{f}||_1$ on both sides,

$$\gamma(\mathcal{C})(\theta + 1)\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k) \geq \Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k). \tag{8}$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(\mathcal{C}) &= \gamma(\mathcal{C})||\hat{f}||_1\Phi(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_k) + (||f||_1 - ||\hat{f}||_1)\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) && (9)\\
&\geq ||f||_1\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) + ||\hat{f}||_1\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k)\frac{\gamma(\mathcal{C})}{(\theta+1)\gamma(\mathcal{C})} - ||\hat{f}||_1\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) && (10)\\
&= ||f||_1\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) + ||\hat{f}||_1\frac{-\theta\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k)}{\theta+1} && (11)\\
&\geq ||f||_1\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) + ||f||_1\frac{-\theta\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k)}{\theta+1} && (12)\\
&= ||f||_1(\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) - \frac{\theta}{\theta+1}\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k)) && (13)\\
&= \frac{1}{\theta+1}||f||_1\Phi(f_1, \ldots, f_k) && (14)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(\mathcal{C}) &\leq \frac{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||f||_1\Phi(f_1,\ldots,f_k)}{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||\hat{f}||_1\Phi(\hat{f}_1,\ldots,\hat{f}_k)+(||f||_1-||\hat{f}||_1)\Phi(f_1,\ldots,f_k)} && (15)\\
&= \frac{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||f||_1\Phi(f_1,\ldots,f_k)}{\beta(\mathcal{C})} && (16)\\
&\leq \frac{\gamma(\mathcal{C})||f||_1\Phi(f_1,\ldots,f_k)}{\frac{||f||_1\Phi(f_1,\ldots,f_k)}{\theta+1}} && (17)\\
&= \gamma(\mathcal{C})(\theta+1) && (18)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.7 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions. Let (G,R,Φ) be a non-atomic k-commodity instance with delay function $\Phi\in\mathcal{C}$. The price of anarchy of congestion games on (G,R,Φ) is $O((\theta+1)a_{max}k^{\theta-1})$*

3.5 POA in k-commodities nonatomic heterogeneous θ-polynomial delay functions

In this section we show bounds on the price of anarchy in k-commodity nonatomic networks with heterogeneous affine and polynomial delay functions. Given delay function $\Phi()$, N_Φ represents maximum number of terms in polynomial representing $\Phi_e()$ over all e.

Lemma 3.8 *Let f be a Nash equilibrium flow and $\hat{f}$ be any feasible flow vector in the instance with heterogeneous θ-polynomial delay functions. Then*

$$C_{NE}(f)\leq kN_\Phi a_{max}(C_{NE}(f))^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}}(C_{SO}(\hat{f}))^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}+C_{SO}(\hat{f})$$

.

Proof: We use the variational inequality defined in Lemma 3.1(also see [22]). The delay function may have two categories of terms : i) summation of all terms that consists of one variable (monomials) and ii) summation of all terms that consists of at least two variables (remember that it is allowed to have cross terms). Let us first consider the part of the delay function which is the summation of monomials. To simplify the presentation we only consider one such term in $\Phi_i(e)$ first, i.e. the generic term in $\Phi_i(e)=\sum_l g_{i\ell}(e)f_\ell^\theta(e)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_e \hat{f}_i(e)(g_{i\ell}(e)f_\ell^\theta(e)) &\leq a_{max}\sum_e \hat{f}_i(e)(f_\ell^\theta(e))\\
&\leq a_{max}(\sum_e \hat{f}_i^{\theta+1}(e))^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}(\sum_e (f_\ell^\theta(e))^{\frac{\theta+1}{\theta}})^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}}\\
&\leq a_{max}C_{SO}(\hat{f})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}\times(\sum_e (f_\ell^\theta(e))^{\frac{1}{\theta}}(\Phi_e^\ell(f)))^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}}\\
&\leq a_{max}C_{SO}(\hat{f})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}\times(\sum_e (f_\ell(e))(\Phi_e^\ell(f)))^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}}\\
&\leq a_{max}C_{SO}(\hat{f})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}C_{NE}(f)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}}
\end{aligned}$$

The term on the LHS in the first inequality arises on the RHS of the variational inequality. The first inequality holds since a_{max} is the largest coefficient over all g_{ij}. The second inequality can be obtained by applying Hölder's inequality. The third inequality is true since $f_\ell^\theta(e) \leq \Phi_e^\ell(f)$ (recall $a_{max} > 1$). The last inequality follows since $\sum_e (f_\ell(e))(\Phi_e^\ell(f)) \leq C_{NE}(f)$.

In the second case, remember that any cross term $f_1^{\theta_1}(e) f_2^{\theta_2}(e) \cdots f_k^{\theta_k}(e) \leq \max(f_1^\theta(e), \ldots, f_k^\theta(e))$ where $\theta_1 + \ldots + \theta_k = \theta$. The ℓ-th term in commodity i satisfies $g_{i\ell}(e) f_1^{\theta_1^\ell}(e) f_2^{\theta_2^\ell}(e) \cdots f_k^{\theta_k^\ell}(e) \leq g_{i\ell}(e) \max(f_1^\theta(e), \ldots, f_k^\theta(e))$. The subsequent bound in this case is obtained similarly to the first case. Based on these two cases, we know that any term in $\Phi_i(e)$ has the same upper bound $a_{max} C_{SO}(\hat{f})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}} C_{NE}(f)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}}$. Since we may have N_Φ terms for the k commodities, the bound in the lemma follows. □

Theorem 3.9 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of heterogeneous θ-polynomial delay functions. If (G, R, Φ) is a k-commodity non-atomic network flow instance with delay functions in $\mathcal{C}$, then the price of anarchy of congestion games on (G, R, Φ) is at most $(2a_{max} k N_\Phi)^{\theta+1}$.*

Proof: We start with the variational inequality.

$$C_{NE}(f) \leq \sum_{e \in E} (\sum_\ell g_{i\ell}(e) f_1^{\theta_1 \ell}(e) f_2^{\theta_2 \ell}(e) \cdots f_k^{\theta_k \ell}(e) + c(e))(\sum_i \hat{f}_i(e))$$

where $\theta_{1,\ell(e)} + \ldots + \theta_{k,\ell(e)} = \theta$. Due to Lemma 3.8,

$$C_{NE}(f) \leq k N_\Phi a_{max} \left(C_{NE}(f)\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}} \left(C_{SO}(\hat{f})\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}} + C_{SO}(\hat{f}).$$

Thus,

$$\left(\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})}\right) \leq k N_\Phi a_{max} \left(\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}} + 1.$$

Let $x = \left(\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})}\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}$ and $t = k N_\Phi a_{max}$. The solution to above can be obtained from the root of $F(x) : x^{\theta+1} - t x^\theta - 1$ which is shown in appendix 6.1. Then, $x \leq 2 k N_\Phi a_{max}$, and thus PoA $= (2 a_{max} k N_\Phi)^{\theta+1}$. □

3.6 k-commodity nonatomic - heterogeneous affine delay functions

We determine a bound on the price of anarchy in k-commodity nonatomic networks with heterogeneous affine delay functions. Based on Lemma 3.8, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 3.10 *Let f and $\hat{f}$ be a Nash equilibrium flow and any feasible flow vector, respectively, in an instance with heterogeneous affine delay functions. Then*

$$C_{NE}(f) \leq k N_\Phi a_{max} \left(C_{NE}(f) C_{SO}(\hat{f})\right)^{1/2} + C_{SO}(\hat{f}).$$

Also, in a fashion similar to Theorem 3.9, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.11 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of heterogeneous affine functions. If (G, R, Φ) is a k-commodity nonatomic instance with delay functions in $\mathcal{C}$, then the price of anarchy of congestion games on (G, R, Φ) is at most $(k^2 N_\Phi^2 a_{max}^2 + \sqrt{(k^2 N_\Phi^2 a_{max}^2)(k^2 N_\Phi^2 a_{max}^2 + 4)})/2 + 1$.*

4 Part II - PoA for Atomic Flows

In this section we consider atomic flows. We start with some negative results on the existence of Nash equilibrium. In general, Nash equilibrium does not exist, even for affine functions, as shown in subsection 4.1. However, we show that Nash equilibrium exists when delay functions are affine and uniform.

Our contributions for the price of anarchy in atomic selfish routing problems is shown in Table 2. For 2-commodity networks with uniform affine delay functions, we show (Table 3)

PoA	affine	θ-polynomial
Aggregate [12]	$(3+\sqrt{5})/2$	$\Theta\left(\frac{\theta}{\log\theta}\right)^{\theta+1}$
Decomposable	$(a_{max}+\sqrt{a_{max}^2+4a_{max}})/2+1^*$ [Thm. 4.4]	$a_{max}(N_\Phi+k\theta)^{\theta+1}$ [Thm. 4.5]

Table 2: PoA for k-commodity Atomic Flows(* indicates an asymptotically tight bound)

improved bounds which are different from the bounds on general decomposable affine delay functions. Note that the bound provided by Thm. 4.8 is an asymptotically tight bound com-

PoA	uniform	decomposable
Affine	$\sqrt{a_{max}}+2^*$ [Thm. 4.8]	$(a_{max}+\sqrt{a_{max}^2+4a_{max}})/2+1$ [Thm. 4.4]

Table 3: PoA for 2-commodity Atomic Flows
(* indicates an asymptotically tight bound)

pared with the lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{a_{max}})$.

4.1 Existence of Atomic NE flow?

We first show that pure Nash equilibrium does not exist in the case of atomic, decomposable and affine delay functions with unweighted demand requirement. In figure 3, there are two



Figure 3: Affine and Decomposable Latency

users with $r_1 = r_2 = 1$(say, unweighted) and the users have the same set of strategies (paths) from source s to destination t. The delay function associated with an edge is shown in figure 3. Let us define four paths $P_1 = \{(s,t)\}, P_2 = \{(s,u),(u,t)\}, P_3 = \{(s,u),(u,v),(v,t)\}$ and $P_4 = \{(s,v),(v,t)\}$. Since the coefficient of the delay for user 2 is very large for the edges in P_1 and P_3, user 2 will not utilize these paths. Thus, there are totally eight pairs of paths each of which are chosen by user 1 and user 2, respectively as shown in Table 4. The strategies

No PNE	path		delay	
	user 1	user 2	user 1	user 2
(P_3, P_2)	P_3	P_2	9	23
(P_3, P_4)	P_3	P_4	15	22
(P_1, P_4)	P_1	P_4	12	21
(P_1, P_2)	P_1	P_2	12	20
(P_4, P_2)	P_4	P_2	10	20
(P_2, P_4)	P_2	P_4	17	21
(P_2, P_2)	P_2	P_2	25	25
(P_4, P_4)	P_4	P_4	24	24

Table 4: Non-existence of Pure Nash Equilibrium

of the two users will be represented by the pair of strategies (P, P') where P and P' belong to the set of 4 paths $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4)$. There exists a sequence of strategy pairs that cycle $\{(P_3, P_2), (P_3, P_4), (P_1, P_4), (P_1, P_2)\}$. Further, other strategies are not stable. Strategy pairs (P_4, P_2) and (P_2, P_2) will shift to the strategy pair (P_3, P_2) because P_3 is more beneficial to user 1. And lastly, strategy pairs (P_2, P_4) and (P_4, P_4) are unstable since the strategy pair (P_3, P_4) is preferred by user 1. This example shows that there may be no pure Nash equilibrium in 2-commodity atomic networks where each edge is associated with affine, decomposable delay functions and each user have one unit of demand requirement (a case usually referred to as unweighted). Note that this is somewhat surprising since it well known that any unweighted congestion game with homogenous delays has at least one pure Nash equilibrium [23, 24].

However, in two-commodity atomic networks when each edge is associated with affine, uniform delay functions, we show that there exists at least one pure Nash equilibrium. This proof applies to both unweighted and weighted demands and is based on the existence of a potential function.

Theorem 4.1 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of affine, uniform delay functions. If (G, R, Φ) is a k-commodity atomic instance with delay functions in $\mathcal{C}$, then (G, R, Φ) admits at least one equilibrium.*

Proof: Consider delay functions of the form $\sum_i a_i(e) f_i(e) + c(e)$. Let us define a potential function $\Psi(f) = \sum_e (d^2(e) + \sum_{j \in S(e)} (a_j(e) r_j(e))^2)$ where $d(e) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i(e) r_i(e) + c(e)$ for every feasible flow f and $S(e)$ represents commodities utilizing e. We claim that a global minimum f of the potential function Ψ is also an equilibrium flow for (G, R, Φ). Let P_i be the path used by commodity i in the solution that minimizes $\Psi(f)$. Assume, for a contradiction, that shifting from path P_i to path $\bar{P}_i$ by user i strictly decreases its delay. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(f, \bar{f}) &= \Phi_{\bar{P}_i}(\bar{f}) - \Phi_{P_i}(f) \\ &= \sum_{e \in \bar{P}_i \setminus P_i} \Phi_e(\ldots, \bar{f}_i(e) = r_i, \ldots,) - \sum_{e \in P_i \setminus \bar{P}_i} \Phi_e(f_1(e), \ldots, f_i(e) = 0, \ldots f_k(e)) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let us consider the potential function Ψ as user i deviates. For any edge $\bar{e}$ in $\bar{P}_i \setminus P_i$, we gain $(d(\bar{e}) + a_i(\bar{e}) r_i(\bar{e}))^2 + a_i^2(\bar{e}) r_i^2(\bar{e}) - d^2(\bar{e}) = 2d(\bar{e}) a_i(\bar{e}) r_i(\bar{e}) + 2a_i^2(\bar{e}) r_i^2(\bar{e})$. For any edge e in $P_i \setminus \bar{P}_i$, we have a change of $d^2(e) - ((d(e) - a_i(e) r_i(e))^2 - a_i^2(e) r_i^2(e)) = 2d(e) a_i(e) r_i(e)$.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\bar{f}) - \Psi(f) &= \sum_{\bar{e}}(2d(\bar{e})a_i(\bar{e})r_i(\bar{e}) + 2a_i^2(\bar{e})r_i^2(\bar{e})) - \sum_e 2d(e)a_i(e)r_i(e) \\ &= 2a_i r_i(\sum_{\bar{e}}(d(\bar{e}) + a_i r_i) - \sum_e d(e)) \\ &= 2a_i r_i(\Phi_{\bar{P}_i}(\bar{f}) - \Phi_{P_i}(f)) \\ &= 2a_i r_i \Delta(f, \bar{f})\end{aligned}$$

The first equality holds due to the definition of potential function Ψ. Since we consider the affine, uniform delay function, $a_i(\bar{e}) = a_i(e) = a_i$ and this results in the second equality. Note that the third equality is satisfied because $a_i r_i$ is the exact amount of delay increase after the user i deviation. Since the delay decrease after user i deviation, $\Delta(f, \bar{f})$ is negative. Further, $a_i, r_i > 0$, and thus the potential function value of $\bar{f}$ is strictly less than the potential value of f, which contradicts that f is a global minimum. □

4.2 k-commodity atomic decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions

In this section we provide bounds on the *price of anarchy* in k-commodity network flows with decomposable delay functions.

4.2.1 A Lower Bound on PoA

We show an example network in figure 4. In this network, the top edge e is associated with the



Figure 4: Affine and Decomposable Latency

delay function $\Phi_e(f_1(e), f_2(e)) = f_1 + af_2$ and the bottom edge h is associated with the delay function $\Phi_h(f_1(h), f_2(h)) = af_1 + f_2$. Demand requirements are defined as $r_1 = 1$ and $r_2 = 1$. The worst-case Nash equilibrium flow vector f is achieved when $f_1(h) = 1$ and $f_2(e) = 1$ and consequently the NE cost $C_{NE}(f) = 2a$. Conversely the social optimum flow $\hat{f}$ can be obtained from $\hat{f}_1(e) = 1$ and $\hat{f}_2(h) = 1$ and the SO cost $C_{SO}(\hat{f}) = 2$.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of affine decomposable delay functions. Let (G, R, Φ) be an atomic two-commodity flow instance such that $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}$. The price of anarchy of atomic flow routing on (G, R, Φ) is $\Omega(a_{max})$ when $a_{max} \geq 2$.*

Note that when $a = 1$, it has been shown that PoA $= 4/3$ [12].

4.2.2 An Upper Bound on PoA

In this section we provide an upper bound on the *price of anarchy* for k-commodity network flows. We first consider affine delay functions, i.e delay functions $\Phi_i(e) = \sum_j a_j f_j(e) + c(e)$. We use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality to prove the following:

Lemma 4.3 *$\mathcal{C}$ be a set of affine decomposable delay functions. Let f and $\hat{f}$ be a Nash equilibrium and a social optimum flow, respectively, in a k-commodity network with an affine decomposable delay functions. Then*

$$C_{NE}(f) \leq (C_{SO}(\hat{f}))^{1/2}\sqrt{a_{max}}(C_{NE}(f))^{1/2} + C_{SO}(\hat{f}).$$

Proof: Let f and $\hat{f}$ be the Nash equilibrium flow and the social optimum flow, respectively for this instance. Let P_i and $\hat{P}_i$ be paths, utilized by commodity i, in a NE and a social optimum solution, respectively. Then by the fact that P_i is used at the NE solution,

$$\sum_{e\in P_i}(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e) + c(e)) \leq \sum_{e\in \hat{P}_i}(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e) + c(e) + a_i(e)r_i).$$

By multiplying both sides by r_i and summing over all commodities, we have the following.

$$\sum_i r_i \sum_{e\in P_i}(a_1(e)f_1(e)+\ldots+a_k(e)f_k(e)+c(e)) \leq \sum_i r_i \sum_{e\in \hat{P}_i}(a_1(e)f_1(e)+\ldots+a_k(e)f_k(e)+c(e)+a_i(e)r_i)$$

and by considering cost on all edges instead of cost on paths, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_e ||f(e)||_1(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e) + c(e)) \\
\leq\ & \sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e) + c(e)) \\
\leq\ & \sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e)) + \\
& \sum_e \left(||\hat{f}(e)||_1 c(e) + \sum_i \hat{f}_i^2(e)a_i(e) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds due to the variational inequality.

Then, cost at Nash equilibrium is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{NE}(f) \leq\ & \sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e)) + \sum_e (||\hat{f}(e)||_1 c(e) + \sum_i \hat{f}_i^2(e)a_i(e)) \\
\leq\ & \sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e)) + \sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1 \sum_i (a_i(e)\hat{f}_i(e) + c(e)) \\
\leq\ & (\sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1^2)^{1/2}(\sum_e (a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e))^2)^{1/2} + \\
& \sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1 \sum_i (a_i(e)\hat{f}_i(e) + c(e)) \\
\leq\ & (\sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1^2)^{1/2}\sqrt{\max_{i,e} a_i(e)}(\sum_e (f_1(e) + \ldots + f_k(e))(a_1(e)f_1(e) + \ldots + a_k(e)f_k(e)))^{1/2} + \\
& \sum_e ||\hat{f}(e)||_1 \sum_i (a_i(e)\hat{f}_i(e) + c(e)) \\
\leq\ & (C_{SO}(\hat{f}))^{1/2}\sqrt{\max_{i,e} a_i(e)}C_{NE}(f))^{1/2} + C_{SO}(\hat{f})
\end{aligned}$$

The third inequality can be obtained by utilizing Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. □

Further,

Theorem 4.4 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of affine, decomposable delay functions. If (G, R, Φ) is a k-commodity atomic instance with delay functions in $\mathcal{C}$, then the price of anarchy of atomic flow routing on (G, R, Φ) is at most $\frac{a_{max}+(a_{max}^2+4a_{max})^{1/2}}{2} + 1$, where a_{max} represents the maximum coefficient in delay function.*

Proof: From Lemma 4.3

$$C_{NE}(f) - a_{max}^{1/2} \left(C_{NE}(f) C_{SO}(\hat{f}) \right)^{1/2} - C_{SO}(\hat{f}) \leq 0,$$

and thus

$$\left(\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} \right) - a_{max}^{1/2} \left(\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} \right)^{1/2} - 1 \leq 0,$$

by dividing by $C_{SO}(\hat{f})$. Then, we obtain a quadratic equation $x^2 - a_{max}^{1/2} x - 1 \leq 0$ where $x = \left(\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} \right)^{1/2}$ which leads to PoA $= \left(\frac{(a_{max}+4)^{1/2}+(a_{max})^{1/2}}{2} \right)^2 = \frac{a_{max}+(a_{max}^2+4a_{max})^{1/2}}{2} + 1$. □

We can extend the above proof to find an upper bound on the price of anarchy in k-commodity atomic networks with decomposable polynomial delay functions. The proof technique is the same as the proof in [1]

Theorem 4.5 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of decomposable θ-polynomial delay functions. If (G, R, Φ) is a k-commodity atomic instance with delay functions in $\mathcal{C}$, then the price of anarchy of atomic flow routing on (G, R, Φ) is $O(a_{max}(N_\Phi + k\theta)^{\theta+1})$.*

4.3 Improved PoA for Uniform Two-Commodity Networks, Affine Delays

In this subsection we provide improved bounds for two-commodity atomic flows when the delay function is affine and uniform, i.e. all edges in the network have the same delay function.

4.3.1 Lower Bounds on PoA for Uniform Delay Functions

For the class of affine functions of the form $af_1 + f_2$ with nonnegative constant, we provide a simple example which shows PoA is $\Omega(\sqrt{a})$. In this network, the top edge e is associated with



Figure 5: Uniform and affine latency

the delay function $\Phi_e(f_1(e), f_2(e)) = af_1 + f_2 + a$ and the bottom edge h is associated with the delay function $\Phi_h(f_1(h), f_2(h)) = af_1 + f_2$. Demand requirements are defined as $r_1 = 1$ and $r_2 = (a)^{1/2}$. The Nash equilibrium(NE) flow vector f has the flow $f_1(h) = 1$ and $f_2(e) = (a)^{1/2}$ and consequently the cost of NE $C_{NE}(f) = a((a)^{1/2} + 2)$. Conversely the social optimum flow $\hat{f}$ can be obtained from $\hat{f}_1(e) = 1$ and $\hat{f}_2(h) = (a)^{1/2}$ and the social optimum cost $C_{SO}(\hat{f}) = 3a$. The price of anarchy is thus $\frac{a((a)^{1/2}+2)}{3a} = \frac{(a)^{1/2}+2}{3}$.

Lemma 4.6 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of affine uniform delay functions. Let (G, R, Φ) be an atomic two-commodity flow instance such that $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}$. The price of anarchy of atomic flow routing on (G, R, Φ) is at least $\frac{(a)^{1/2}+2}{3}$, i.e., $\Omega(\sqrt{a})$.*

4.3.2 Almost tight upper bound for Uniform Functions

Consider $F_{\bigotimes} = (F - \hat{F}) \bigcup (\hat{F} - F)$ where F and $\hat{F}$ are a Nash equilibrium flow and a social optimum flow, respectively. Further we let F_1 and F_2 denote the sub-flows of F at a Nash equilibrium flow for commodity 1 and commodity 2, respectively. Similarly, we let $\hat{F}_1$ and $\hat{F}_2$ denote the social optimum flow for commodity 1 and commodity 2, respectively. Note that $\bigotimes$ cancels common flows in F and $\hat{F}$. We let edges in $F_1 \bigotimes \hat{F}_1$ be thicker and edges in $F_2 \bigotimes \hat{F}_2$ be thinner.

By reversing the flow in $\hat{F}$ and partitioning $F_1 \bigotimes \hat{F}_1$ and $F_2 \bigotimes \hat{F}_2$, respectively, we obtain a set of cycles for commodity 1 and commodity 2. We let the cycles represented by thicker lines be denoted by CC^1 for commodity 1 and cycles represented by the thinner lines by CC^2 for commodity 2. Note that an edge could be utilized by commodity 1 as well as commodity 2, and it can occur in cycles of both commodities. We need a lemma which show that there exists a good partition of the cycles so that we can obtain an almost tight upper bound.

Let (a_i, b_i) be a collection of pairs where $1 \leq i \leq d : a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Let Π be a set of partitions of $I = \{1, \ldots, d\}$ such that

- If $\pi = (\pi^1, \ldots, \pi^\ell) \in \Pi$ then $|\pi^j| \leq 2$,

  Note the following are true
- If $\pi = (\pi^1, \ldots, \pi^\ell) \in \Pi$ then $\bigcup_j \pi^j = I$,
- If $\pi^{j_1}, \pi^{j_2} \in \pi$ and $\pi^{j_1} \neq \pi^{j_2}$ then $\pi^{j_1} \bigcap \pi^{j_2} = \emptyset$.

Lemma 4.7 *Let $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi$ be an optimum partition of I defined as follows.*

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi : \max_{\pi^{j'} \in \pi} \frac{\sum_{\ell \in \pi^{j'}} a_\ell}{\sum_{\ell = \in \pi^{j'}} b_\ell} \geq \max_{\hat{\pi}^j \in \hat{\pi}} \frac{\sum_{\ell \in \hat{\pi}} a_\ell}{\sum_{\ell \in \hat{\pi}} b_\ell}$$

where $\hat{\pi} = (\hat{\pi}^1, \ldots, \hat{\pi}^q)$ and $\hat{\pi}^j$ corresponds to the j-th part and is a subset (of at most 2 elements) of I of size t_j, i.e. $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{t_j}\}$. Then

$$\frac{a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_d}{b_1 + b_2 + \ldots + b_d} \leq \max_{\hat{\pi}^j \in \hat{\pi}} \frac{\sum_{\ell \in \hat{\pi}^j} a_\ell}{\sum_{\ell \in \hat{\pi}^j} b_\ell}.$$

Analyzing PoA bounds for Cycles We next show that PoA can be estimated by considering at most one cycle per commodity instead of all cycles. Throughout this subsection, let $a = a_1/a_2$ where a_1 and a_2 represent coefficients of commodity 1 and commodity 2 in the affine uniform delay function.

Let $\mathcal{CC}$ be the set of all cycles and Π be a set of partitions of $\mathcal{CC}$. Let partition $\bar{\pi}$ of $\mathcal{CC}$ where each part is of size either 1 or of size 2 (in which case it contains 1 cycle from each commodity, $C^1 \in CC^1$ and $C^2 \in CC^2$). Let the pair (f_1, f_2) and $(\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2)$ be the Nash equilibrium flow of commodity 1 and commodity 2 and social optimum flow of commodity 1 and commodity 2,

respectively. Let $\hat{\pi} = \{\hat{\pi}^1, \ldots, \hat{\pi}^q\}$ be a partition which guarantees the optimum cost amongst partitions in Π. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} &= \frac{\sum_{e\in E}(f_1(e)+f_2(e))\Phi(f_1(e),f_2(e))}{\sum_{e\in E}(\hat{f}_1(e)+\hat{f}_2(e))\Phi(\hat{f}_1(e),\hat{f}_2(e))} \\
&\leq \max_{\hat{\pi}^j\in\hat{\pi}}\left(\frac{\textit{cost of NE flow in cycles or combinations of cycles in } \hat{\pi}^j}{\textit{cost of SO flow in cycles or combinations of cycles in } \hat{\pi}^j}\right) \\
&\leq \max_{\bar{\pi}^j\in\bar{\pi}}\left(\frac{\textit{cost of NE flow in cycles or combinations of cycles in } \bar{\pi}^j}{\textit{cost of SO flow in cycles or combinations of cycles in } \bar{\pi}^j}\right) \\
&\leq \max\{\max_{\bar{\pi}^j=(C^1,C^2)}\frac{f_1\Phi_{C^1}(f_1,f_2)+f_2\Phi_{C^2}(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_{C^1}(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)+\hat{f}_2\Phi_{C^2}(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)}, \max_{\bar{\pi}^j=(C^1)}\frac{f_1\Phi_{C^1}(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_{C^1}(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)}, \max_{\bar{\pi}^j=(C^2)}\frac{f_2\Phi_{C^2}(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_2\Phi_{C^2}(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)}\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi_{C^1}()$ and $\Phi_{C^2}()$ represent cost incurred in C^1 and C^2, respectively. The first inequality holds due to Lemma 4.7. In the last inequality, we have $|\bar{\pi}^j| = 2$ for the first factor and $|\bar{\pi}^j| = 1$ for the second and third factors. In Lemma 4.7, we show that the maximum cost element in $\hat{\pi}$ provides an upper bound for $C_{NE}(f)/C_{SO}(\hat{f})$. So, the partition $\bar{\pi}$ considered here provides an upper bound for $C_{NE}(f)/C_{SO}(\hat{f})$. Later we will show that this partition is good enough to obtain an almost tight bound for $C_{NE}(f)/C_{SO}(\hat{f})$.

To analyze the price of anarchy, we consider the structure of the cycles.

Cycle Structure In this subsection we consider the structure of the cycles obtained in $F \bigotimes \hat{F}$. One of the cycle obtained is illustrated in figure 6. Here u and v are starting and end nodes such that reversing of $\hat{f}_1$ leads to a cycle. Though there are cycles for commodity 1 and commodity 2, we consider cycles for commodity 1. We consider flow from commodity 1 as a primary flow and flow from commodity 2 as a secondary flow, respectively. The case when flow from commodity 2 is a primary flow is symmetric to this case. Note that though we consider cycles from commodity 1, it is possible that those might be intersected with cycles from commodity 2. We show an example of a cycle from commodity 1 intersecting with commodity 2 flows in Figure 6. In figure 6, the thinner and solid line represent f_2; while the thinner and dashed lines



Figure 6: An example of a cycle from commodity 1

represent $\hat{f}_2$. As shown in figure 6, f_2 and $\hat{f}_2$ are intersected with a cycle of commodity 1 and also f_2 and $\hat{f}_2$ can overlap each other.

Depending on how the NE flow and social optimum flow use the top and bottom path in the cycle, we have sixteen possibilities. We show that three cases dominate all other cases and thus we provide an upper bound of the PoA for these three cases.

Notation As shown in Figure 5, we have two paths, termed as top path and bottom path. Throughout this section, let $\Phi_{P_i}(f_1, f_2)$ be cost of path P_i when flow on path P of commodity 1 is f_1 and that on path P of commodity 2 is f_2. We define $\Phi'_{P_i}(f_1, f_2)$ as cost function of a

set of edges $P' \subseteq P_i$, which is utilized by both f_1 and f_2. Similarly for $P'' \subseteq P$ let $\Phi''_{P_i}(f_1, 0)$ (or $\Phi''_{P_i}(0, f_2)$) be defined as the cost function over a set of edges P'' which is utilized by f_1 (or f_2), but not both. Note that $P' \bigcap P'' = \emptyset$. For simplicity, we define $\Phi_{P_i}(f_1, f_2) = \Phi_i(f_1, f_2)$, $\Phi'_{P_i}(f_1, f_2) = \Phi'_i(f_1, f_2)$, $\Phi''_{P_i}(f_1, 0) = \Phi''_i(f_1, 0)$ and $\Phi''_{P_i}(0, f_2) = \Phi''_i(0, f_2)$.

Also, throughout this subsection we let P_1, P_2 correspond to edges containing flows of both commodities in the top path and the bottom path from u_1 to v_1, respectively. And we let P_3 and P_4 correspond to the edges common to both flows on the top path and the bottom path from u_2 to v_2, respectively as shown in Figure 7. Lastly, we define $\ell_1 = |\{e \in P_1 \bigcap E\}|, \ell_2 = |\{e \in P_2 \bigcap E\}|, \ell_3 = |\{e \in P_3 \bigcap E\}|$ and $\ell_4 = |\{e \in P_4 \bigcap E\}|$. Remember that $f_1 = \hat{f}_1 = r_1$ and



Figure 7: Two cycles - one cycle per each commodity.

$f_2 = \hat{f}_2 = r_2$ due to the definition of atomic network model in this section.

Three cases are enough to be considered Note the f and $\hat{f}$ correspond to a NE flow and a social optimum flow. We consider all possible cases when commodity 1 flow is considered



Figure 8: All Cases

as a primary flow as shown in Figure 8 (The notation is the set of flows on the top path vs. the flows on the bottom path): (1) $\{f_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2\}$, (2) $\{f_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2\}$, (3) $\{f_1, f_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$, (4) $\{f_1, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$, (5) $\{f_1, f_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2\}$, (6) $\{f_1, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2\}$, (7) $\{f_1, f_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1\}$, (8) $\{f_1, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1\}$, (9) $\{f_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$, (10) $\{f_1\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2\}$, (11) $\{f_1\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1\}$, (12) $\{f_1\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2\}$, (13) $\{f_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1\}$, (14) $\{f_1\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2, \hat{f}_2\}$, (15) $\{f_1, \hat{f}_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2\}$ and (16) $\{ f_1, f_2\}$ vs. $\{\hat{f}_1, f_2\}$. By reversing $\hat{f}_1$, each of the structures considered becomes a directed cycle. As mentioned before f_2 or $\hat{f}_2$ (or both) use edges in these cycles. Table 5 lists the cases and variational inequality obtained by the flow being Nash equilibrium. Let us consider case 16 to show an example how to construct formulas for $C_{NE}(f)/C_{SO}(\hat{f})$ using the corresponding variational inequality. There are two NE flows f_1 and f_2 over the top path, and the cost of NE for commodity 1 is $f_1\Phi_1(f_1, f_2)$; while, the cost of SO for commodity 1 is incurred only by $\hat{f}_1$ which results in $\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1, 0)$. Its corresponding variational inequality is $\Phi_1(f_1, f_2) \leq \Phi'_2(f_1, f_2) + \Phi''_2(f_1, 0)$ since a shift of flow f_1 to the bottom

	ratio of $C_{NE}(f)$ to $C_{SO}(\hat{f})$	variational inequality
case 1,5	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2'(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)+\hat{f}_1\Phi_2''(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)\leq\Phi_2(f_1,0), \Phi_1(f_1,f_2)\leq\Phi_2(0,f_2)$
case 2,16	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)\leq\Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$
case 3,9	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2'(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)+\hat{f}_1\Phi_2''(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)\leq\Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$
case 4,14	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,0)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2'(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)+\hat{f}_1\Phi_2''(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,0)\leq\Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$
case 6,10,11	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,0)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,0)\leq\Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$
case 7,13	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)\leq\Phi_2(f_1,0), \Phi_1(f_1,f_2)\leq\Phi_2(0,f_2)$
case 8	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,0)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,0)\leq\Phi_2(f_1,0)$
case 12,15	$\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,0)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2'(\hat{f}_1,\hat{f}_2)+\hat{f}_1\Phi_2''(\hat{f}_1,0)}$	$\Phi_1(f_1,0)\leq\Phi_2(f_1,0)$

Table 5: $C_{NE}(f)/C_{SO}(\hat{f})$ for all cases

path (note that f_2 already exists) does not decrease the cost incurred by f_1 and f_2 over the top path.

(i)cases 1, 5, 7 and 13 Note that both case 1 and case 5 have the same ratio of $C_{NE}(f)$ to $C_{SO}(\hat{f})$ and variational inequality, and case 7 and case 13 use the same ratio of $C_{NE}(f)$ to $C_{SO}(\hat{f})$ and variational inequality. Then cost of case 1 and case 5 is upper bounded by case 7(case 13) since the divisor in case 7(case 13) is smaller than divisors in other two cases since $f_1=\hat{f}_1=r_1$ and $f_2=\hat{f}_2=r_2$.

In case 7 (or 13), note that there is no social optimum flow from commodity 2 in the ratio of $C_{NE}(f)$ to $C_{SO}(\hat{f})$, and the NE cost incurred by commodity 2 can be considered from commodity 2 cycles. However, f_2 has impact on latency of f_1, and we consider $f_1\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)$ as cost incurred by f_1 and f_2.

$$\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})}\leq\frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)}\leq\frac{r_1\Phi_1(r_1,r_2)}{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,0)}\leq\frac{r_1\Phi_1(r_1,r_2)}{r_1\Phi_1(r_1,r_2)}=1.$$

We have the first inequality since $f_1=\hat{f}_1=r_1$ and $f_2=\hat{f}_2=r_2$ due to the definition of atomic unsplittable flow. The last inequality holds since $\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)\leq\Phi_2(f_1,0)$ due to its corresponding variational inequality.

(ii)cases 2, 3, 9 and 16 Since the divisor for case 2 and case 16 is smaller than divisors in case 3 and case 9, the price of anarchy in case 3 and case 9 are dominated by the other two

cases. For both case 2 or case 16, we have the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} &\leq \frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)} && (19)\\
&\leq \frac{f_1\Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+f_1\Phi_2''(f_1,0)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)} && (20)\\
&= \frac{r_1\Phi_2'(r_1,r_2)+r_1\Phi_2''(r_1,0)}{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,0)} && (21)\\
&\leq \frac{\Phi_2(r_1,r_2)}{\Phi_2(r_1,0)} && (22)\\
&= \frac{a_2\ell_2(ar_1+r_2+c_2')}{a_2\ell_2(ar_1+c_2')} \leq 1+\frac{r_2}{ar_1} && (23)
\end{aligned}$$

In (20), $\Phi_1(f_1,f_2) \leq \Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$ due to the corresponding variational inequality. We have $c_2' = c_2/a_2$ in (23). It seems that the price of anarchy for these cases are not bounded since f_2 appears in the dividend while the divisor does not include $\hat{f}_2$. However, if r_2 is big enough (larger than $a\sqrt{a}r_1$) then r_2 play an important role. Thus, we consider splitting into two cases : $r_2 \leq a\sqrt{a}r_1$ and $r_2 > a\sqrt{a}r_1$. In the case that $r_2 \leq a\sqrt{a}r_1$, the price of anarchy is bounded by $\sqrt{a}+1$.

We next discuss the price of anarchy when $r_2 > a\sqrt{a}r_1$. Note that we assume that there is an intersection of a commodity 2 cycle with this cycle when $r_2 > a\sqrt{a}r_1$. If there is no intersection with a commodity 2 cycle, then f_1 can be shifted from the top path to the bottom path leading to less delay. If the delay on the top path and the delay on the bottom path are the same, then there is no cycle. Suppose that the shift from the top path to the bottom path of f_1 does not decrease delay. It implies that the cost of the bottom path is greater than the cost of the top path and potentially violates utilizing the bottom path by $\hat{f}_1$ is less cost than using the top path.

Let us consider the cycle of commodity 2. f_2 goes along top path overlapped with f_1 or $\hat{f}_1$ on the bottom path. The flow f_2 and the other flow $\hat{f}_2$ forms the cycle of commodity 2 which is intersecting with a cycle shown in case 2. For this cycle, we derive the price of anarchy via the corresponding variational inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} &\leq \frac{f_1\Phi_1'(f_1,f_2)+f_1\Phi_1''(f_1,0)+f_2\Phi_1'(f_1,f_2)+f_2\Phi_2(0,f_2)+f_2\Phi_3'(f_1,f_2)+f_2\Phi_3''(0,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)+\hat{f}_2\Phi_4(0,\hat{f}_2)}\\
&\leq \frac{f_1\Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+f_1\Phi_2''(f_1,0)+f_2\Phi_4(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)+\hat{f}_2\Phi_4(0,\hat{f}_2)} && (24)\\
&\leq \frac{f_1\Phi_2(f_1,f_2)+f_2\Phi_4(f_1,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0)+\hat{f}_2\Phi_4(0,\hat{f}_2)} && (25)\\
&= \frac{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,r_2)+r_2\Phi_4(r_1,r_2)}{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,0)+r_2\Phi_4(0,r_2)} && (26)\\
&= \frac{r_1\ell_2(ar_1+r_2+c_2')+r_2\ell_4(ar_1+r_2+c_4')}{r_1\ell_2(ar_1+c_2')+r_2\ell_4(r_2+c_4')} && (27)\\
&= \frac{r_1\ell(ar_1+r_2+c_2')+r_2(ar_1+r_2+c_4')}{r_1\ell(ar_1+c_2')+r_2(r_2+c_4')} && (28)\\
&= 1+\frac{r_1r_2\ell+ar_1r_2}{r_1\ell(ar_1+c_2')+r_2(r_2+c_4')}. && (29)
\end{aligned}$$

We have $\Phi_1'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2(0,f_2)+\Phi_3'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_3''(0,f_2) \le \Phi_4(f_1,f_2)$ due to the variational inequality for commodity 2 and $\Phi_1'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_1''(f_1,0) \le \Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$ due to the variational inequality for commodity 1. By these observations, we can obtain (24) from the previous equation. Inequality (25) can be obtained by summing over $\Phi_2'(f_1,f_2)$ and $\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$ by replacing $\Phi_2''(f_1,0)$ as $\Phi_2''(f_1,f_2)$. Let $\ell = \ell_2/\ell_4$ where ℓ_2 and ℓ_4 represent the number of edges on path 2 and path 4, respectively. Also, let $c_2' = c_2/a_2, c_4' = c_4/a_2$ throughout this chapter. From the above variational inequality $\Phi_1'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_2(0,f_2)+\Phi_3'(f_1,f_2)+\Phi_3''(0,f_2) \le \Phi_4(f_1,f_2)$ we have $\Phi_2(0,f_2) \le \Phi_4(f_1,f_2)$ and further

$$\ell = \ell_2/\ell_4 \le \frac{ar_1+r_2+c_4'}{r_2+c_2'} \le \frac{ar_1+r_2+c_4'}{r_2}.$$

When $\frac{ar_1+r_2+c_4'}{r_2+c_2'} \le 1$, let ℓ be 0 in the divisor and be 1 for the dividend. Then, equation (29) can be written as

$$\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} \le 1+\frac{r_1r_2+ar_1r_2}{r_2(r_2+c_4')} \le 1+\frac{r_1r_2+ar_1r_2}{r_2^2} \le 2+\frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}. \tag{30}$$

The last inequality holds because $r_2 \ge a\sqrt{a}r_1$, and $a \ge 1$. When $\frac{ar_1+r_2+c_4'}{r_2+c_2'} \ge 1$, note that $\frac{ar_1+r_2+c_4'}{r_2} \ge 1$ is true. Equation (29) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} &\le 1+\frac{r_1r_2(ar_1+r_2+c_4')/r_2+ar_1r_2}{r_1\ell(ar_1+c_2')+r_2(r_2+c_4')} && (31)\\
&\le 1+\frac{r_1(r_2/\sqrt{a}+r_2+c_4')+ar_1r_2}{r_1\ell(ar_1+c_2')+a\sqrt{a}r_1(r_2+c_4')} && (32)\\
&\le 1+\frac{(a+1+1/\sqrt{a})r_2+c_4'}{\ell(ar_1+c_2')+a\sqrt{a}(r_2+c_4')} && (33)\\
&\le 1+\frac{(a+1+1/\sqrt{a})r_2+c_4'}{a\sqrt{a}(r_2+c_4')} \le 1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}+\frac{2}{a\sqrt{a}} && (34)
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\ell(ar_1+c_2')$ can be ignored to obtain the upper bound in (34). In equations, to maximize the price of anarchy we substitute r_1 with $r_2/a\sqrt{a}$ in the dividend; while in the divisor we substitute r_2 with $a\sqrt{a}r_1$.

(iii)cases 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15 Note that the divisors in case 6, 10 and 11 are smaller than others, and the dividend in case 6, 10 and 11 are bigger than others due to the variational inequality.

We consider one of the cases 6, 10 and 11. As shown in previous case, we need to consider commodity 1's cycle and commodity 2's cycle to estimate the price of anarchy. We provide a proof of a case when $\hat{f}_2$ is utilizing the top path. Let us consider case 6 which upper bounds other two cases. we split into three sub-cases: (a) $r_1 \le r_2 \le (a)^{1/2}r_1$, (b) $r_1 > r_2$ and (c)

$r_2 > (a)^{1/2} r_1$. In case (a),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} &\leq \frac{f_1\Phi_1(f_1,0) + f_2\Phi_2(0,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0) + \hat{f}_2\Phi_1(0,\hat{f}_2)} && (35)\\
&\leq \frac{f_1\Phi_2(f_1,f_2) + f_2\Phi_2(0,f_2)}{\hat{f}_1\Phi_2(\hat{f}_1,0) + \hat{f}_2\Phi_1(0,\hat{f}_2)} && (36)\\
&\leq \frac{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,r_2) + r_2\Phi_2(0,r_2)}{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,0) + r_2\Phi_1(0,r_2)} && (37)\\
&\leq \frac{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,r_2) + r_2\Phi_2(0,r_2)}{r_1\Phi_2(r_1,0)} && (38)\\
&\leq \frac{\Phi_2(r_1,r_2)}{\Phi_2(r_1,0)} + \frac{r_2}{r_1}\frac{\Phi_2(0,r_2)}{\Phi_2(r_1,0)} && (39)\\
&\leq 1 + \frac{\ell_2\sqrt{a}r_1}{\ell_2(ar_1+c_2')} + \frac{r_2}{r_1}\frac{\ell_2(\sqrt{a}r_1+c_2')}{\ell_2(ar_1+c_2')} && (40)\\
&\leq 1/\sqrt{a} + 2 && (41)
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the variational inequality, we have (36) by replacing $\Phi_1(f_1,0)$ with $\Phi_2(f_1,f_2)$. In inequality (40), we substitute r_2 with $\sqrt{a}r_1$. In case (b), we start at (37) to avoid duplicate formulas.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} &\leq \frac{r_1\ell_1(ar_1+r_2+c_2') + r_2\ell_2(r_2+c_2')}{r_1\ell_1(ar_1+c_2') + r_2\ell_2(r_2+c_1')} && (42)\\
&\leq 1 + \frac{\ell_1 r_1 r_2 + \ell_2 r_2 c_2'}{\ell_1(ar_1^2 + r_1c_2') + \ell_2(r_2^2 + r_2c_1')} && (43)\\
&\leq 1 + \max\left(\frac{r_1r_2}{ar_1^2+r_2^2}, \frac{r_2c_2'}{r_1c_2'+r_2c_1'}\right) && (44)\\
&\leq 1 + \max\left(\frac{1}{ar_1/r_2 + r_2/r_1}, 1\right) \leq 1 && (45)
\end{aligned}$$

Due to Lemma 4.7, (44) holds. In equation (45), the divisor is minimized when r_1/r_2 is close

to 1. Lastly, in case (c),

$$\frac{C_{NE}(f)}{C_{SO}(\hat{f})} \leq \frac{\ell_1 f_1(af_1+c_1')+\ell_2 f_2(f_2+c_2')}{\ell_1 \hat{f}_2(\hat{f}_2+c_1')+\ell_2 \hat{f}_1(a\hat{f}_1+c_2')} \tag{46}$$

$$\leq \frac{\ell f_1(af_1+c_1')+f_2(f_2+c_2')}{\ell \hat{f}_2(\hat{f}_2+c_1')+\hat{f}_1(a\hat{f}_1+c_2')} \tag{47}$$

$$\leq \frac{\ell r_1(ar_1+c_1')+r_2(r_2+c_2')}{\ell r_2(r_2+c_1')+r_1(ar_1+c_2')} \tag{48}$$

$$\leq \frac{r_1(ar_1+c_1')\frac{ar_1+r_2+c_2'}{ar_1+c_1'}+r_2(r_2+c_2')}{r_2(r_2+c_1')\frac{r_2+c_2'}{ar_1+r_2+c_1'}+r_1(ar_1+c_2')} \tag{49}$$

$$\leq \frac{r_1(ar_1+r_2+c_2')+r_2(r_2+c_2')}{r_2\frac{r_2+c_2'}{\sqrt{a}+1}+r_1(ar_1+c_2')} \tag{50}$$

$$\leq \frac{(r_1 r_2}{r_2\frac{r_2+c_2'}{\sqrt{a}+1}+r_1(ar_1+c_2')}+\frac{r_1(ar_1+c_2')+r_2(r_2+c_2')}{r_2\frac{r_2+c_2'}{\sqrt{a}+1}+r_1(ar_1+c_2')} \tag{51}$$

$$\leq \frac{r_1 r_2}{\frac{r_2^2}{\sqrt{a}+1}+ar_1^2}+\sqrt{a}+1 \tag{52}$$

$$\leq \frac{\sqrt{(\sqrt{a}+1)}}{2\sqrt{a}}+\sqrt{a}+1 \leq \sqrt{a}+2. \tag{53}$$

By dividing by ℓ_2 we obtain (47), and we further have (48) due to the definition of atomic unsplittable. Due to the variational inequality, we have $\Phi_1(f_1,0) \leq \Phi_2(f_1,f_2)$ and $\Phi_2(0,f_2) \leq \ell\Phi_1(f_1,f_2)$ where $\ell = \ell_1/\ell_2$ and ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 represent the number of edges in path 1 and path 2 respectively. Inequality (49) is derived from the previous inequality by using the variational inequality. Further, by dividing by r_2+c_1' and substituting r_1 with $r_2/\sqrt{a}$, we have (50). In other words, $\frac{r_2+c_1'}{ar_1+r_2+c_1'} \geq \frac{r_2+c_1'}{\sqrt{a}r_2+r_2+c_1'} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}+1}$. Since $\frac{r_1(ar_1+c_2')+r_2(r_2+c_2')}{r_2\frac{r_2+c_2'}{\sqrt{a}+1}+r_1(ar_1+c_2')} \leq (\sqrt{a}+1)\frac{r_1(ar_1+c_2')+r_2(r_2+c_2')}{r_2(r_2+c_2')+r_1(ar_1+c_2')} = \sqrt{a}+1$ due to $a \geq 1$, we have (52). In (52), $r_1/r_2 = 1/\sqrt{a(\sqrt{a}+1)}$ and thus we have the second last inequality. Since $a \geq 1$, $\frac{\sqrt{(\sqrt{a}+1)}}{2\sqrt{a}} \leq 1$ at the end.

Theorem 4.8 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a set of uniform affine delay functions. If (G,R,Φ) is an atomic 2-commodity instance with delay functions in $\mathcal{C}$, then the price of anarchy of (G,R,Φ) is at most $\sqrt{a_{max}}+2$ and this is almost tight as shown in Lemma 4.6.*

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have studied the price of anarchy for k-commodity nonatomic and atomic network flows with heterogeneous and decomposable delay functions. We have also obtained improved bounds on the price of anarchy for 2-commodity atomic flows with heterogeneous uniform delay functions.

Further studies should include convex functions that model the behavior of network delays more accurately, in order to shed more light on the impact of differentiated services.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported in part via NSF grant CCF 1451574.

References

[1] Awerbuch, Baruch and Azar, Yossi and Epstein, Amir The Price of Routing Unsplittable Flow Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing STOC 57-66 2005

[2] Richard Cole, Yevgeniy Dodis and Tim Roughgarden Bottleneck links, variable demand, and the tragedy of the commons Networks 194-203 2012

[3] Moshe Babaioff and Robert Kleinberg and Christos H. Papadimitriou Congestion games with malicious players Games and Economic Behavior 22-35 2009

[4] Babaioff, Moshe and Kleinberg, Robert and Papadimitriou, Christos H. Congestion games with malicious players Proceedings of the 8th ACM conference on Electronic Commerce 103-112 2007

[5] Ackermann, Heiner and Rglin, Heiko and Vcking, Berthold Pure Nash Equilibria in Player-Specific and Weighted Congestion Games Internet and Network Economics Lecture Notes in Computer Science 50-61 2006

[6] Milchtaich, Igal Congestion Games with Player-Specific Payoff Functions Games and Economic Behavior 111-124 1996

[7] D. Weitz The price of anarchy. Unpublished manuscript University of California, Berkeley, CA 2001

[8] Correa, Jose R. and Schulz, Andreas S. and Stier Moses, Nicolas E. Computational Complexity, Fairness, and the Price of Anarchy of the Maximum Latency Problem Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Sloan School of Management Working papers 2004

[9] Correa, José R. and Schulz, Andreas S. and Stier-Moses, Nicolás E. Fast, Fair, and Efficient Flows in Networks Oper. Res. 215-225 2007

[10] Correa, Jose R. and Schulz, Andreas S. and Stier-Moses, Nicola's E. A geometric approach to the price of anarchy in nonatomic congestion games Games and Economic Behavior 457-469 2008

[11] Wardrop, J. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Part II Some theoretical aspects of road traffic research 352-362 1952

[12] Roughgarden, Tim and Tardos, Éva How bad is selfish routing? J. ACM 236-259 2002

[13] Dubey, Pradeep Inefficiency of Nash Equilibria Mathematics of Operations Research, 1-8, 1986

[14] Elias Koutsoupias and Christos Papadimitriou Worst-case equilibria Proceedings of the 16th Annual Symposium on Thoretical Aspects of Computer Science, 404-413, 1999

[15] S. C. Dafermos and F. T. Sparrow The Traffic Assignment Problem for a General Network Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standars 73B, 91-118, 1969

[16] S. C. Dafermos An Extended Traffic Assignment Model with Applications to Two-Way Traffic *Transportation Science*, 366-389, 1971

[17] S. C. Dafermos Traffic Assignment Problem for Multiclass-user Transportation Networks Transportation Science, 73-87, 1972

[18] Odlyzko, Andrew Paris Metro Pricing for the Internet *EC* 140-147 1999

[19] J. M. Peha International Journal of Communication 2007

[20] Pigou, A. C. The economics of welfare Macmillan 1920

[21] Aland, Sebastian and Dumrauf, Dominic and Gairing, Martin and Monien, Burkhard and Schoppmann, Florian Exact Price of Anarchy for Polynomial Congestion Games Lecture Notes in Computer Science *STACS* 218-229 2006

[22] S. C. Dafermos Traffic equilibrium and variational inequalities *Transportation Science* 42-54 1980

[23] Rosenthal, R. W. A class of games possessing pure-strategy Nash equilibria *International Journal of Game Theory* 65-67 1973

[24] Dov Monderer and Lloyd S. Shapley Potential Games *Games and Economic Behavior* 124-143 1996

[25] Roughgarden, Tim The maximum latency of selfish routing Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms SODA 980-981 2004

[26] Tim Roughgarden Selfish routing with atomic players SODA 1184-1185 2005

[27] Correa, José R. and Schulz, Andreas S. and Stier-Moses, Nicolás E. Fast, Fair, and Efficient Flows in Networks Oper. Res. 215-225 2007

[28] Junghwan Shin Network Congestion and Resource Allocation Game *PhD Thesis* 2013

[29] Cobham, Alan Priority Assignment in Waiting Line Problems Journal of the Operations Research Society of America 70-76 1954

[30] Christos Papadimitriou and Gregory Valiant A New Look at Selfish Routing Innovations in Computer Science 2010

[31] Monsef, E. and Anjali, T. and Kapoor, S. INFOCOM, 2014 Proceedings IEEE Price of Anarchy in network routing with class based capacity guarantees 2409-2417 2014

[32] A. Nagurney A multiclass, multicriteria traffic network equilibrium model Mathematical and Computer Modelling 2000

[33] R.B. Potts and R.M. Oliver Flows in Transportation Networks Academic Press 1972

6 Appendix

6.1 Price of Anarchy for k-Commodity Non-Atomic Network Flows

The proof of Theorem 3.9 is shown below. Recall that $F(x) : x^{\theta+1} - tx^{\theta} - 1$. Consider the following recursion:

- $x_{(1)} = t$.
- $x_{(2)} = t(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}$.
- $x_{(3)} = t((1 + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}})^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}} + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}$.

and in general,

$$x_{(n+1)} = t\left(\left(\frac{x_{(n)}}{t}\right)^{\theta} + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}.$$

We claim that $x_{(n)}, n \to \infty$ is a root of $F(x)$. First we show that $x_{(n)}, n \to \infty$ converges to a limit. This is shown by $\forall i : F(x_{(i)}) \leq 0$ and $F(x_{(n)}) < F(x_{(n+1)})$.

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_{(n+1)}) - F(x_{(n)}) &= (x_{(n+1)}^{\theta+1} - tx_{(n+1)}^{\theta} + 1) - (x_{(n)}^{\theta+1} - tx_{(n)}^{\theta} + 1) \\ &= x_{(n+1)}^{\theta+1} - tx_{(n+1)}^{\theta} - x_{(n)}^{\theta+1} + tx_{(n)}^{\theta} \\ &= x_{(n+1)}^{\theta}(x_{(n+1)} - t) - x_{(n)}^{\theta}(x_{(n)} - t) \\ &> (x_{(n+1)}^{\theta} - x_{(n)}^{\theta})(x_{(n)} - t) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $x_{(n+1)} = t((x_{(n)}/t)^{\theta} + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}$ which leads to $x_{(n+1)}^{\theta+1} = tx_{(n)}^{\theta} + 1$.

From the recurrence for $x_{(n+1)}$, we have that $x_{(n+1)}^{\theta+1} < tx_{(n+1)}^{\theta} + 1$ as well as $x_{(n+1)}^{\theta+1} = tx_{(n)}^{\theta} + 1$. By combining these inequality and equality, we have $x_{(n)} < x_{(n+1)}$ (Remember that $\theta \geq 2$). The last inequality can be derived due to $(x_{(n+1)} - t) > (x_{(n)} - t)$. At the end, $x_{(n+1)}^{\theta} > x_{(n)}^{\theta}$ due to $t < x_{(n)} < x_{(n+1)}$ and $\theta \geq 2$ resulting in $F(x_{(n)}) < F(x_{(n+1)})$. We obtain $x_{(n+1)} = t(y^{\theta} + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}}$ by letting $x_{(n)} = ty$. As n goes to infinity, we reach a limit point, termed y, which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} ty = x_{(n+1)} = t(y^{\theta} + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}} &\Rightarrow \\ y = (y^{\theta} + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}} &\Rightarrow \\ y = y^{\frac{\theta}{\theta+1}}(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}y^{\theta}})^{\frac{1}{\theta+1}} &\Rightarrow \\ y = (1 + \frac{1}{t^{\theta+1}y^{\theta}}) & \end{aligned}$$

Note that $t \geq 1$ and $y = x_{(n)}/t \geq t/t \geq 1$ which implies that $y \leq 2$.

6.2 Price of Anarchy is unbounded for arbitrary

We show an example network in figure 9. In this network, the top edge e is associated with the delay function $\Phi_e(f_1(e), f_2(e)) = f_1 f_2 + f_2^2$ and the bottom edge h is associated with the delay



Figure 9: An example of an unbounded price of anarchy

function $\Phi_h(f_1(h), f_2(h)) = f_1 f_2 + f_1^2$. Demand requirements are defined as $r_1 = 1$ and $r_2 = 1$. The worst-case Nash equilibrium flow vector f is achieved when $f_1(h) = 1$ and $f_2(e) = 1$ and consequently the Nash equilibrium cost $C_{NE}(f) = 2$. Conversely the social optimum flow $\hat{f}$ can be obtained from $\hat{f}_1(e) = 1$ and $\hat{f}_2(h) = 1$ and the SO cost $C_{SO}(\hat{f}) = 0$. Therefore, the price of anarchy is unbounded.